

REMARKS

Applicants hereby traverse the current rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the remarks contained herein. Claims 3-4, 9-11, 15, 19, and 21-28 are indicated as having allowable material. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lundh et al. (US '895, hereinafter Lundh).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim," see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim," see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Claim 1 defines a distributed redundant control signal distribution system that includes a first control signal source co-located with a first set of control signal controlled circuit elements, and at least one second control signal source co-located with a second set of control signal controlled circuit elements. Lundh does not disclose at least these limitations. In Lundh, the clock generators are centrally located, while the data circuits that use the clock signals are located in different stations, see the Abstract, as well as column 4, line 7. Thus, the clock generating circuits of Lundh are not co-located with the data circuits. Thus, these elements of Lundh do not meet the claimed first and second control signal sources and the first set and second set of circuit elements. Thus, Lundh does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that for the above reasons claim 1 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claim 12 defines a method for distributing control signals among a plurality of electronic boards that includes, on each said first and second board, hierarchically controlling said control signals such that either of said control signals originating from said first or from said second electronic boards are operative to control said controlled signal controlled circuitry on all of said electronic boards. Lundh does not disclose at least these limitations. Lundh teaches each clock selector 3 makes an independent choice of the best clock signal to use for its associated data circuit, see column 7, lines 45-55, and column 8, lines 15-21. Nothing in Lundh teaches that a control signal originating from said first or from said second electronic boards is operative to control said controlled signal controlled circuitry on all of said electronic boards. Moreover, Lundh also does not teach that the invention of Lundh involves electronic boards. Thus, Lundh does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that for the above reasons claim 12 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claim 16 defines a system for controlling clock signals for a plurality of electronic boards that includes a clock source on at least two of said electronic boards, and a controller on each of said boards, said controller operable for hierarchically selecting clock signals from at least one of said signal connections; and wherein said signal controllers on said first and second electronic boards are further operable for hierarchically selecting one or the other of said clock sources. Lundh does not disclose at least these limitations. The clock selectors of Lundh make only one selection, namely, the best clock signal. The clock selectors do not make a second selection. Nothing in Lundh is operable to select clock signals from at least one of said signal connections and is operable to select one or the other of said clock sources. Moreover, Lundh also does not teach that the invention of Lundh involves electronic boards. Thus, Lundh does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that for the above reasons claim 16 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claim 20 defines a method for protecting electronic circuits from dual clocking signal failures that includes providing to the input of a controller on each electronic circuit a clock signal generated local to said controller and said output further supplying clock signals as inputs to said dual independent transmission facilities. Lundh does not disclose at least these limitations. In Lundh, the clock generators are not local to the clock selectors. Instead, the clock

generators are centrally located, while the clock selectors are located in different stations, see the Abstract, as well as column 4, line 7. Moreover, the output of the clock selectors does not input into a dual independent transmission facility. Instead, a single transmission line is used to send the output to each of the downstream data circuits. Thus, Lundh does not teach all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that for the above reasons claim 20 is patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Claims 2, 5-8, 13-14, and 17-18 depend from base claims 1, 12, and 16, respectively, and thus inherit all limitations of their respective base claim. Each of claims 2, 5-8, 13-14, and 17-18 sets forth features and limitations not recited by Lundh. Thus, the Applicants respectfully assert that for the above reasons claims 2, 5-8, 13-14, and 17-18 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

Conclusion

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-4, 9-11, 15, 19, and 21-29 include allowable subject matter.

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.


Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 200313420-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Label No. EV 482713219US in an envelope addressed to: M/S Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313.

Date of Deposit: November 7, 2006


Typed Name: Joy H. Perigo

Signature: _____



Respectfully submitted,

By: _____



Michael A. Papalas
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,381
Date: November 7, 2006
Telephone No. (214) 855-8186